

Duplicate or forged State Lottery Ticket

† Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, I gave notice of a motion under rule 312 about duplicating of lottery tickets in which one D. Mallikarjunappa, a Municipal Councillor of Davangere Municipality, has given a petition to the Secretary to the Government, Finance Department on 17-3-70. His complaint is that he purchased a State lottery ticket in 'O' series bearing No. 1544344 from one M. Krishnamurthy who is the authorised agent of the Mysore State Lottery tickets at Davangere. Half an hour later he learnt that another friend of his B. J. Siddappa had purchased another ticket in 'O' series bearing the same number 1544344. They got suspicious. Then they went to the agent and asked him about it. The agent took them to the Vysya Bank wherefrom they had those tickets. The Vysa Bank said that they had nothing to do with it and asked them to approach the Government of Mysore. Hence the complaint was given to the Government of Mysore. There the matter rests, I had been to Davangere a few days back and on Sunday I learnt that there was a terrible scare regarding duplication of these lottery tickets. I am told that the International Sale Agency is the sole agent for the distribution of these tickets and we have heard that there is a lot of under-selling. From Mysore and other places, I have received a number of telegrams saying that these tickets are not available. I am told that black-market has also started. When I say this I speak with a sense of responsibility. I do not wish to embarrass the Finance Minister or the Government of Mysore. In the first place, in principle I am opposed to this system of lottery for the reason that Government are not going to get any extra funds. In the first two draws they might have got 35 to 40 lakhs subject to correction but this time they have put up a special prize of 5 lakhs common to all series and they have to sell one crore worth of tickets. If the State were to get something I can very well understand. Most of it is eaten away by middlemen or the agents or some of those who are in that orbit and very little goes to the common man. The result is that lotteries, sub-lotteries and 10-paise lotteries have started and the morals are corroded. Even a boy is prepared to steal 10 paise from the house and got and invest it in a lottery. That shows the extent to which the morals have been deprived. If once people take to gambling we really do not know where it will end. When I once went casually to a village in my constituency, I saw 300 copies of the Deccan Herald being bought there everyday. There are hardly ten people who know English in that village. I was curious to know why they were purchasing. I came to know that all of them were interested in the opening number and closing number of American Cotton Sale and they used to invest a lot of money in lottery. A good man lost Rs. 1½ to 2 lakh. The Government unnecessarily increases gambling and they are not going to get any additional revenue to the State. When we were young we used to hear of lottery tickets only in Goa and the Derby Sweeper. Now if every house becomes a place for lottery, this is one way of corroding public

morals. I know the Hon. Minister is having an open mind in this matter. Let him examine it and see whether there is any room for duplication. People have duplicated in each series and there is bound to be ill-gotten money. I want them to clarify the position.

† Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE (Minister for Finance, Planning and Youth Welfare).—Sir, immediately when this case was brought to the notice of the Finance Secretary, this was thoroughly investigated. The facts of the case are as under.....

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, today's Demand deals with lottery. Now a policy statement on lottery is being made by the Finance Minister in reply to the motion of the hon'ble Member Sri Siddaveerappa. If we go on allowing special discussions like this on the days allotted for Demands, then what is the use of discussing Demands? This matter can as well be discussed under today's Demand. Already 45 minutes are over. At this rate there will be no discussion on Demands.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon. Leader of the Opposition might remember that this point was raised some two or three days back and yesterday also it came up for discussion. I had promised Hon. ble Member Sri Siddaveerappa that whether the Finance Minister came or not it would be taken up at 1 P.M. to day after Question Hour. There was no Question Hour today and so it was taken up now. I hope my friend Sri Sivappa would appreciate the position. After the reply is given, if members are not satisfied with it, it is open to them to raise their points while speaking on the Demand.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—I am on a point of order. I presume that the Chair has permitted the Government to reply to the point raised by Sri Siddaveerappa under Rule 312. Rule 312 reads as follows :

“A member who wishes to bring to the notice of the Assembly any matter which is not a point of order shall give notice to the Secretary in writing stating briefly the point which he wishes to raise in the Assembly together with reasons for wishing to raise it and he shall be permitted to raise it only after the Speaker has given his consent and at such time and date as the Speaker may fix.”

Accordingly, the matter has been brought to the notice of this House. But I wish to know under what rule the Chair has permitted the hon. Minister to answer the point or read a statement. In fact, a statement should be made in response to a call Attention Notice under Rule 63. Therefore this matter is brought to the notice of the House only, and not to the notice of the Government. Hence, a reply by the Government is not necessary. When the matter has been brought to the notice of the Minister, let the House consider it at the appropriate time but not now at the time of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is a surprising objection. Whenever any matter is raised by any Member, belonging to either the Opposition or the ruling party, the Government have to state their position. Otherwise, it remains incomplete. When a matter is brought to the notice of the Government a statement by the Government is necessary. The Hon'ble Finance Minister will proceed with his statement.

† Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE.—Sir, The facts of the case are as under :

In a book containing 100 tickets of the "O" Series, with numbers from 1544301 to 1544400, two tickets with number 1544344 happened to be there one in the place of 1544334 and another in the place of 1544344. This printing defect arose actually in the process of correction of defective tickets.

There was some defect in ticket No. 1544334 and in the final checking, it was returned for correction and replaced. At the correction branch, another ticket was printed to replace the defective ticket and on this stage this numbering error took place. Instead of the number 1544334, the number 1544344 was printed and sent back to the final checking branch. Here again, the ticket escaped notice and the book containing the ticket went to the Vysya Bank at Davanagere; from there it was purchased by Sri Krishnamurthy, a Sub Agent of the Lottery Scheme. He sold both the tickets to one Sri Mallikarjunappa and Sri Siddappa of Davanagere. On a representation from Sri Mallikarjunappa to the Finance Secretary, the entire position was examined in consultation with the Director of Printing and Stationery and a reply has been sent to the party replacing the two tickets in the place of the duplicate tickets. The cancelled tickets are available with the Press.

It was only a printing and numbering error a very rare case and that too only one out of crore tickets printed and released for the third draw. Where printing, numbering, checking, correcting and re-checking of 100 lakhs of tickets involved such errors were expected in spite of all precautions at the Press. Therefore, the following provisions were made in the terms and conditions of the agency :

"14. The Sub-Agent shall satisfy himself that the tickets sold to him by the Bank are free from printing and numbering defects. If there are any such defects, he shall straightaway approach the Bank and get such defective ticket book or books replaced.

"15. Sub-Agents shall abstain from selling defective tickets."

This matter of simple error in printing and numbering of lottery tickets sold through a bank to an authorised agent need not be a matter of public importance.

The precautions at the printing press have been further tightened and the Mysore Sales International, Ltd., has been requested to warn the sub-agencies to observe Rules 14 and 16 of agency rules very carefully.

In regard to one or two points raised by the hon'ble Member, I would like to reply in the course of my general reply to the debate.

Calling Attention to a Matter of Urgent Public Importance

Re: Police atrocities by the Police of Krishnarajapuram Police Station against one Sri Nagaraj, a worker of the Indian Tin Industries on 23rd February 1970.

SRI R. DAYANANDA SAGAR.—Sir, we wish to call the attention of the Hon. Chief Minister to the very grave Police atrocities committed by the Police of Krishnarajapuram Police Station on Sri Nagaraj, a worker of the Indian Tin Industries on 23rd February 1970, by beating him severely, forcibly pouring urine into his mouth, shaving his hair, parading him in the street and launching a case against him and others belonging to other political parties. Could this great injustice ever be done against any individual in any civilised nation?

MR. SPEAKER.—There is no Provision for a speech under Rule 63. The Chief Minister will make the Statement.

† **SRI VEERENDRA PATIL** (Chief Minister).—Sir, on 23rd March 1970, at about 7-30 P.M. information was received by the Police headquarters that more than 1,000 persons had gathered near Krishnarajapuram Police Station and creating disturbance. Senior Police Officers immediately rushed to the spot.

One casual labourer in the Indian Tin Industries, Krishnarajapuram, by name Sri V. Nagaraj, aged about 18 years, was in the Police Station and there was a big crowd of about a thousand around the Police Station. Sri V. Nagaraj complained that on the morning of 23rd March 1970 he was brought to the Police Station by three Police Constables, beaten by them and later one more Constable joined them. He also alleged that the Police asked one of the two persons in the Police Station to urinate in his mouth which one of them did. He further alleged that a barber was brought in and his head was shaved. On recording the statement of Sri V. Nagaraj and others, the boy was sent to the Bowring Hospital for treatment. The crowd which had gathered were pacified by the Senior Police Officers who also promised that departmental action would be taken against the concerned. After considerable persuasion they dispersed at about 11 P.M.

Four Police Constables against whom allegations have been kept under suspension and enquiry initiated against them. Patrolling is being continued in Krishnarajapuram and the situation is peaceful.